

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,827	07/06/2001	Barry H. Schwab	VID-02202/29	8990
25006 7	590 08/22/2006		EXAMINER	
GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE & CITKOWSKI, P.C			ORGAD, EDAN	
PO BOX 7021 TROY, MI 4	PO BOX 7021 TROY, MI 48007-7021		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
11.01, 11.1			2618	
			DATE MAILED: 08/22/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	09/900,827	SCHWAB ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Edan Orgad	2618				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I.  lely filed  the mailing date of this communication.  D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 Ma	av 2006					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	action is non-final.					
<i>;</i> —	<i>,</i> —					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3 and 5-7</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
· <u> </u>						
6) Claim(s) 3, 5-7 is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage</li> </ul>						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
	·					
Attachment(s)		,				
1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  6) Other:						
	٠, ٢, ٥, ١, ١, ١, ١, ١, ١, ١, ١, ١, ١, ١, ١, ١,					

Application/Control Number: 09/900,827

Art Unit: 2618

#### DETAILED ACTION

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3 and 5-7 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3 and 5-7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen (US 6,804,338) in vie of Khan (US 2002/0191776).

Regarding claim 3, Chen teaches a communication device having a speed dial function, including the steps of

Storing a plurality of telephone numbers in the device in a list of numbers to be dialed (col. 1, lines 58-67) and entering an abbreviated command to sequence through the list to dial each stored number (col. 3, lines 37-53- Chen teaches a redial function, inherenetly a redial function speeds up dialing by utilizing abbreviated commands).

Chen teaches automatically deleting a number from the list (fig. 2, steps 210, 211) but fails to specifically disclose automatically deleting a number from the list after a call to that number has been completed.

In related art, Khan teaches automatically deleting a number from the list after a call to that number has been completed (¶ 0018 & 0019, a call list is processed until it is exhausted, meaning that until nothing is left - implying that records are removed from the list once they've been called).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Khan's teaching of deleting a number from the list after a call to that number has been completed with Chen's electronic telephone directory in order to eliminate unnecessary calls and therefore eliminate unnecessary communications costs.

Regarding claim 5, Chen teaches the step of leaving a number on the list for later recall if the call to that number could not be completed at the time it was dialed (Chen teaches deleting a number after memory is full, col. 4, lines –6)

Regarding claims 6 and 7, Chen as modified by Khan fail to specifically disclose the abbreviated command either entered manually of spoken by a user. However, official notice is taken that it is well known in the art to use redial commands in either manual or spoken entry methods. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to either use manual or user spoken redial entry with Chen's modified invention in order to provide the user with a wide array of entry redial sequences.

Application/Control Number: 09/900,827

Art Unit: 2618

### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edan Orgad whose telephone number is 571-272-7884. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00AM to 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban can be reached on 571-272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Edan Orgad

EDAN ORGAD PATENT EXAMINER/TELECOMM.

Primary Patent Examiner Telecommunications.